



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCLXIX.

APRIL, 1879.

I.

RETRIBUTION IN POLITICS.

NEARLY ten years ago the right of the colored man to vote was made as firm and secure as a constitutional provision could establish it. As a question of public policy and justice it was settled. The people passed upon and decided that. There remained but the tests and ordeal of experience. It was not to be disturbed or questioned except for great and permanent evils. This was the condition of the right of colored suffrage when two important facts attracted attention. The first was, that the Congressional representation of the Southern States had been greatly strengthened ; and the second was, that the colored vote could no longer be relied upon by the Republican party, but that it was rapidly passing into the Democratic party, resulting in a Congressional delegation from the South almost entirely Democratic, and in a solid South. Confident possession and control of that vote were followed by such disappointment at its loss as attends the loss of property deemed most secure.

The disappointment was intensified by the reflection that the entire colored population is now to be counted in apportioning representation among the several States, and that the political influence of the South is thereby increased. Dissatisfaction and a spirit of resistance appeared among those who had looked upon the colored vote as permanently secure to their party. They spoke

freely, sometimes harshly, about striking down the increased Southern representation, and seemed willing to abandon colored suffrage, if necessary to that end. It was because of this sentiment and feeling that the discussion of negro enfranchisement in the last number of the "Review" was possible. Two or three years ago it would have been welcomed neither by editor nor reader. And from this it appears how little the sentiment of humanity, and how much the consideration of party advantage, influenced and controlled the action of many who at one time were most clamorous for negro suffrage. Negro suffrage rests upon the natural right of the citizen, or upon constitutional provision, or upon both. I was opposed to its recognition and establishment in the Constitution of the United States; but, when declared to be so established, I recognized it as fixed and permanent. And, in the article which I contributed to the series, I thought it quite sufficient to maintain that it was thus fixed and permanent; and I endeavored to show that, under favorable opportunities, its exercise need not be hurtful to society.

In his article, Governor Hampton treats the question as settled, and says that, whatever may have been the policy or the motives of men, the right conferred by the Constitution is irrevocable, and that it is now the part of statesmanship to give its exercise that direction which will be most beneficial and least hurtful to the body politic. Speaking for the people of Mississippi, Mr. Lamar, with great force and directness, maintains that, being made a free man, a property-holder, and a tax-payer, the negro could not be excluded from the "privilege and duty," the "right and obligation" of the citizen to vote. He mentions the striking fact that, in 1869, "the white people of Mississippi unanimously voted at the polls in favor of ratifying the enfranchising amendment. Mr. Stephens treats the question of negro suffrage as settled, and not to be disturbed; and declares it the duty of all friends of humanity to give it a fair trial, "with an earnest and hopeful effort for its success." I have grouped the arguments of these three distinguished men of the South that the justice and liberality of their views may distinctly and together appear.

The most striking quality of General Garfield's argument is that, while in set phrase he is for free suffrage, in tone and spirit he makes an apology for failure. Conceding that the property rights of the colored people are every year being more and more respected, he yet asserts that it is a mockery to say that suffrage

has been free. With marked emphasis he declares that in many parts of the South the benefits of suffrage have been defeated by fraud, violence, and threats of loss of employment. Are we compelled to take a view so discouraging? Or is it but the language of the partisan? In respect to political rights, the races are equal. Together they are now to conduct public affairs. Is there such incompatibility that the races can not harmonize in maintaining good government? Will the stronger race domineer over the weaker? This has been the prediction of many. The hopes of the people rejected the prediction. Now, however, a strong man, one who has observed much, and whose hopes have all been for the success of what Mr. Blaine speaks of as an experiment, declares it in a large degree a failure. If the experiment has failed during these last ten years, why has it failed? During much of that time the army of the United States was distributed throughout the South. It was used to maintain the supremacy of the Republican party, through the instrumentality of the colored vote. For like purpose the Federal judiciary was used in many localities. It may not be claimed that there was then good government in the South. It was bad—bad for the colored man, as it was for the white man. It was the substitution of force and fear for the constitutional government by the people. That was the period of corruption, and strife, and bloodshed. In such a period we can not judge of any attribute of free government, or of the capability of any part of the people to maintain free government. That period passed away, and with it the corrupting influence of the Freedman's Bureau. The political adventurers who exercised power without right or merit, and enjoyed wealth without labor, "sought safety in flight." Thus the malign influences were removed that had sowed distrust and discord, and excited hostility between the races. If General Garfield will only consider the colored man's improved condition since this change took place, his greater freedom in the exercise of his political rights, his conceded security in the enjoyment of his civil rights, and his more harmonious relations with the white race, he will surely review and reconsider the opinion which he expressed, that, in many parts of the South, the negro has been deprived of all the benefits intended to be conferred upon and secured to him by the suffrage.

Mr. Blaine thinks the negro is controlled, whatever way he may vote. He attributes his conduct to some influence stronger than that of his own conviction and will. What does he mean by "the

persuasion of the Freedman's Bureau," at the period when the vote was all one way? To whom does he refer as "the men who controlled the negro vote at the outset, in the interest of the Republican party"? They were the same "adventurers who exercised power without right or merit, and amassed wealth without labor." They were the coadjutors of the Freedman's Bureau. The combined influence was pernicious. The officers and agents of the Bureau were its emissaries. They were found everywhere. They obtained and abused the confidence of the colored people. They provoked and organized the strife of the races.

The control of the vote by these influences could not last. It soon came to an end. The colored people could not be kept in ignorance of their real and true interests. They learned that the increase of public indebtedness and the profligate expenditure of public money would place burdens upon their own shoulders, and impair the value of the products of their labor. Influenced by these and other proper considerations, they united in large numbers with the Democrats. The result was, as I have said, the restoration to the Southern States of the right of local self-government, and a purer and better administration of public affairs. Mr. Blaine is not willing to concede to the colored voter a change of party relations upon intelligent conviction. He attributes such a change to fraud and violence; for he says that, by "fraud, intimidation, violence, and murder, free suffrage on the part of the negro in the South is fatally impaired." For a statement so broad Mr. Blaine must rely upon evidence "of the baser sort," much of which has long since been rejected.

How is it that Mr. Blaine may claim much credit for his early and continued support of negro suffrage, and yet deny to the negro the capacity of free and uncontrolled action? It may not be questioned that, in the days of his political vassalage, the negro was under the control of what Mr. Blaine describes as the "persuasion of the Freedman's Bureau," and of the men who controlled his vote "in the interest of the Republican party"; but his capacity of intelligent election is not to be questioned merely because he may become a Democrat. Mr. Blaine makes the argument (or rather the claim) that for emancipation, for citizenship, for civil rights, and for political privileges, the negro is indebted to the Republican party, and that therefore his allegiance is to that party; and that so long as he is allowed the freedom of choice he can and will vote with no other party. He declares it the "recklessness of assumption," "the

very bravado of argument," to claim that, upon his own choice, he would vote with the Democrats. That is the strongest statement ever made against negro suffrage. The vote is nearly one million. The claim is that it is not free—is never to be free, but belongs to a party; that, because of past obligations, it can not change. In its membership and in its aggregate it can not change. It can not consider questions of principle or questions of policy. It may not listen to the demands of patriotism, nor the appeals of self-interest, as opposed to the requirements of the party. Its obligation to party can never be discharged. Whether questions relate to the honor of the country or the welfare of the people, it can exercise no free and independent judgment. It would be a matter of serious concern, could a party claim a vassalage so numerous and so abject. But that claim is being repudiated by the colored vote itself. In the demonstrations preceding the elections, and at the polls, its independent action in many of the States has stamped the claim of ownership as false and arrogant.

But Mr. Blaine asks the question, "Why should the negro have been disposed to vote with the Democratic party?" Is that question asked by one who sincerely believes in the capacity of the negro to vote intelligently upon questions affecting the public welfare, and that his action will be governed by an enlightened judgment and a patriotic purpose? Then I answer that the same considerations should govern the negro that ought to govern any other voter. He should vote upon his convictions of right and duty. If Democratic policy is more likely to promote the public good, then it should be supported by the white and colored voter alike. He who tells me how the white man should vote tells me as well how the colored man should vote. When once in the box the ballot has no color. Its only quality depends upon the fitness of the candidate it may help to elect, and upon the views he may carry into legislation, or the measures he may adopt in the administrative service. A full answer to the question would require a statement of the reasons why any citizen should give that party his support. Such reasons might be found in its devotion to constitutional obligations; in its adherence to the "supremacy of the civil over the military"; in its maintenance of the separation and mutual independence of church and state, "for the sake alike of civil and religious freedom"; in its hostility to a "corrupt centralism," which threatens the destruction of the right of local self-government; and in its devotion to economy in public expenditures.

It may be said by many, both white and black, We do not adopt all the dogmas of the Democratic party, nor approve its entire record, but we will declare our condemnation of the centralism, the extravagance, and the corruption of its powerful opponent. Our record shall not be in approval of the frightful crimes that characterized a late Administration. The taxes were not reduced, but the revenues were impaired. Remorseless severity was the rule of collection ; official favoritism the standard of accountability. We will not help to establish such precedents. Is this not language which the citizen ought to use ? Please tell me why it is not as becoming and proper for the colored as for the white voter ? What obligation does he owe to party that takes from him the right to use this, the language of patriotism ?

Is the question repeated ? Then I say that the colored voter, if intelligent to understand his duty, and honest to discharge it, could not remain with the party that corrupted and destroyed the State governments of the South. I will be pardoned for appropriating and reproducing what Mr. Lamar has so well said on this subject : "Reference has been made to the great change which the election returns show in the negro vote throughout the South. The phenomenon is easily explained. Let any intelligent Northern man review the history of the State governments of the South for the last ten years under Republican rule—their gross and shameless dishonesty, their exorbitant taxation, their reckless expenditure, their oppression of all native interests, the social agonies through which they have forced all that was good and pure to pass as through a fiery furnace ; the character of the men—many of them—they have placed in power ; and then say if such a state of things in a Northern or Western State would not have been a sure and natural precursor of a Republican defeat, so absolute and complete that the very name of the party would have become in that State a name of scorn and reproach. Then why should not that result have occurred in the South ? Are we to assume that the black race have neither instinct nor reason—have no sense, no intelligence, no conscience, no independence ; that in every Southern State the thralldom of the negro vote to party leaders, even when abandoned by them, is so unquestioning and abject that no amount of misrule can cut him loose from them or teach him the advantage of a more natural and wholesome political alliance ? To reason thus is simply to say that the negro is unfit for suffrage, and to surrender the argument to those who hold that he ought to be disfranchised."

The influences that governed many of the colored people in aiding the whites to place the Southern States under Democratic control were truly stated by one of themselves, the most prominent man of the race. For the first time after reconstruction, the Democrats carried Mississippi in 1875. Because the colored race had the majority in that State, the fairness of the election was disputed. In Congress and in the Northern press, with great bitterness and positiveness, the result was attributed to fraud and violence. There was then, as now, no difficulty in obtaining the testimony of willing witnesses to establish violence.

The Rev. H. W. Revels, a colored man, had recently, before that time, been a United States Senator from that State. He was an observer of public events. On the 7th of November, 1875, a few days after the election, and before the result was fully known, he addressed the following letter to President Grant :

MY DEAR SIR: In view of the results of the recent election in our State, I have determined to write you a letter canvassing the situation, and giving my views thereon. I will premise by saying that I am no politician. Though having been honored by a seat in the United States Senate, I never have sought political preferment, nor do I ask it now, but am engaged in my calling—a minister—and, feeling an earnest desire for the welfare of all the people, irrespective of race or color, I have deemed it advisable to submit to you for consideration a few thoughts in regard to the political situation in this State.

Since reconstruction, the masses of my people have been, as it were, enslaved in mind by unprincipled adventurers, who, caring nothing for the country, were willing to stoop to anything, no matter how infamous, to secure power to themselves and perpetuate it. My people are naturally Republicans, but, as they grow older in freedom, so do they grow in wisdom. A great portion of them have learned that they were being used as mere tools, and; as in the late elections, not being able to correct the existing evil among themselves, they determined by casting their ballots against these unprincipled adventurers to overthrow them.

My people have been told by these schemers, when men were placed upon the ticket who were notoriously corrupt and dishonest, that they must vote for them; that the salvation of the party depended upon it; that the man who scratched the ticket was not a Republican. This is only one of the many means these malignant demagogues have devised to perpetuate the intellectual bondage of my people. To defeat this policy at the late election men irrespective of race or party affiliations united and voted together against men known to be incompetent and dishonest.

The bitterness and hate created by the late civil strife have, in my opinion, been obliterated in this State, except perhaps in some localities, and would

have been long since entirely effaced were it not for some unprincipled men who would keep alive the bitterness of the past and inculcate hatred between the races in order that they may aggrandize themselves by office and the emoluments to control my people, the effect of which is to degrade them. I give you my opinion that, had our State administration adhered to Republican principles, and stood by the platform upon which I was elected, the State would have been on the high-road to prosperity. If the State administration had advanced only to patriotic measures, appointed only honest men to office, and sought to restore confidence between the races, bloodshed would have been unknown. Peace would have prevailed; Federal interference would have been unthought of, and harmony, friendship, and mutual confidence would have taken the place of the bayonet.

In conclusion, let me say to you, and to the Republican party of the North, that I deem it my duty, in behalf of my people, that I present these facts in order that they and the white people, their former owners, should not suffer misrepresentation, which certain demagogues seem desirous to encourage.

Respectfully,

H. W. REVELS.

A stronger document can not be produced in favor of colored suffrage. It is a plain statement of the cruel bondage that had been maintained by "corrupt rings" over both races, and of the means used to "inculcate" hatred between them. Having a majority in the State, the colored people were able to continue the strife of the races, and to perpetuate their own political power. But intelligently and patriotically they united with the whites to overthrow the power of the "unprincipled adventurers," to drive them from the State, and to restore good government. The help came like food and water to a starving and famished people. And for it honorable and grateful return was made, at the next session of the Legislature, in the enactment of laws providing extraordinary security for the rights of labor in Mississippi.

Why confuse and cheapen a discussion like the present by thrusting into it questions of personal consistency? Why turn aside to consider one another's motives? Who of the readers of the "Review" cares for either? But Mr. Blaine thinks it useful to his argument to suggest that in my eyes the complexion of the colored man depends upon his voting the Democratic ticket. Devotion to truth compels me to say that my confidence in his judgment as an independent voter is strengthened by the circumstance that I do find him voting that ticket. Really, I could not respect him very much if Mr. Blaine's opinion of him were correct, that he is a political fixture, immovable under influences that control other and

patriotic minds. Prior to the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, but as late as September, 1865, Governor Morton, in a carefully prepared speech, used the following language: "Look at their condition. As I said before, only one in five hundred that can read—many of them, until within the last few months, never off the plantation—most of them never out of the county in which they live and were born, except as they were driven by the slave-drivers. *Can you conceive that a body of men, white or black, who have been in this condition, and their ancestors before them, are qualified to be immediately lifted from their present state into the full exercise of political power, not only to govern themselves and their neighbors, but to take part in the Government of the United States? Can they be regarded as intelligent or independent voters? The mere statement of the fact furnishes the answer to the question.*"

Because of a subsequent zeal, so extreme as to be questionable, for the adoption of the Fifteenth Amendment, would Mr. Blaine describe him as "a conspicuous convert," and attribute his zeal to a desire to add to the voting strength of his party? Since the adoption of the amendment was declared, it has received that true support from the Democratic party which each citizen owes to every provision of the Constitution.

In the month of February, 1870, I visited the city of New Orleans for the first time. Quite unexpectedly I was called upon to speak at a Democratic meeting. Without note or preparation whatever, I stepped upon the platform, decided upon one thing only, and that was to say just what was becoming on my part to speak, and proper for the men of Louisiana to hear. For no purpose of self-vindication, but as expressing my present views, I will quote from what I then said:

"It is a question for you to consider very carefully what attitude you men of the South shall occupy toward the colored population. There is a deliberate purpose on the part of adventurers from the North—a class of men who are described as carpet-baggers—to appropriate the entire colored vote of the South to their cause. And what is their cause? It is not your cause; it is not the colored man's cause; it is the cause of plunder. And the question presents itself in this form: Are you men of the South willing that these adventurers shall appropriate that large vote—in some of the Southern States a majority of the entire vote? . . . New relations have come to exist between you and the colored people of the South. How will you place yourselves in regard to

these new relations? They have not been of your seeking, and they may, perhaps, not have been sought by the negro, but he is a voter in Louisiana, as he will be in Indiana, if the Fifteenth Amendment is declared adopted, and it is not worth your while, nor is it worth my while, to go back on the fixed fact. These new relations are upon you. How are you to conduct yourselves toward the colored people? Is it possible that the stranger can now come in and make these ancient servants of yours his servants and your enemy? In my judgment, the colored people will be satisfied if you assure them that you will give them just laws, fairly administered. Do this, and then the outside adventurer can not turn their votes against you. Let the colored man understand that the legislation of your State is not being carried on to make a few men rich at the expense of the great body of the people. . . . Appeal to the colored man to stand by you in your fight for honesty, for justice, for integrity, and for equal laws, and that appeal will reach his heart as readily as it reaches the heart of the great body of the white people."

Why does Mr. Blaine depart from the subject of his argument, to arraign many of the States for their policy toward the colored people? He recites in much detail the provisions of statutes which he attributes to the intention of reënslaving the race; and he charges the responsibility upon the Democratic party. A better understanding of the responsibility that attaches to either party, in that regard, requires a more exact statement of the steps by which the States passed from the condition of war into practical relations with the Union. The first period was that of the provisional governments. The policy of establishing such governments had its origin in Mr. Lincoln's amnesty proclamation of December 8, 1863. Under its provisions the authority of the United States was declared restored over portions of the State of Louisiana, and "a loyal State government was reinaugurated."

Mr. Blaine says, "It was reserved for Louisiana to outdo both South Carolina and Mississippi in this horrible legislation," and he specifies that, the contract once made, the negro laborer was not allowed to leave his place of employment during the year, except upon prescribed conditions; deductions might be made from wages for injuries done to animals and implements committed to his care; and for bad or negligent work; and impudence, swearing, and indecent language, and quarreling and fighting with one another, were prohibited and punished. What think you of this charge

against the States, that it is an abridgment of the freedom of the negro that he is forbidden to indulge in impudence, swearing, and indecent language in the presence of the family where he is employed?

Why were such regulations required or permitted? At that time the agricultural laborers of that State were exclusively colored. They constituted a majority of the entire population. At once, and without preparation, they were transferred from a condition of servitude to one of freedom. No one could predict what would follow. It was soon apparent that their tendency was to abandon the country, and crowd the cities, and follow the camps. Men of both sections contemplated the possible results with anxiety. Was freedom to mean exemption from labor only? Congregating in large numbers, and unemployed, were they to sink into vice, and to degenerate into vagrancy? The benevolent and the humane were anxious about the result, for the sake of the colored people themselves. Men in responsible and public positions had also to consider the possible effect upon the material welfare of the country. Was an entire section to remain without labor? Were the lands to lie without cultivation? Should we become the purchasers from other lands, and not the producers of the great staples of the South? Mr. Lincoln seems to have considered all these questions; for in his amnesty proclamation, to which I have referred, there is this remarkable paragraph: "I do further proclaim, declare, and make known that any provision which may be adopted by such State government in relation to the freed people of such State, which shall recognize and declare their permanent freedom, provide for their education, and which may yet be consistent, as a temporary arrangement, with their present condition, as a laboring, landless, and homeless class, will not be objected to by the national Executive."

A State Constitution was soon thereafter adopted. It established the permanent freedom and provided for the education of the "freed people." To carry out Mr. Lincoln's suggestion in the paragraph which I have quoted, it only remained to adopt such regulations as were necessary and proper for the "freed people," as a "laboring, landless, and homeless class."

General Banks was then in command in Louisiana. He gave construction to the paragraph in the orders he issued and in the regulations he adopted. In his General Order No. 23, February 3, 1864, he based his regulations of labor upon the assumption "that

labor is a public duty, and idleness and vagrancy a crime," and that this law of labor should be enforced. He fixed the prices to be paid at from three to eight dollars per month. He provided that wages should be deducted in case of the sickness of the laborer, and that, if the laborer feigned sickness, food also might be withheld. It was also provided that "indolence, insolence, disobedience of orders, and crime should be suppressed by forfeiture of pay, and such punishments as are provided for similar offenses by army regulations." Under that order the colored laborer of Louisiana was placed under military rule; and, if insolent or disobedient to his employer, would suffer loss of pay, and other punishment such as would be inflicted upon a soldier guilty of disobeying the orders of his commanding officer. By other regulations, "no hand could leave the place without written license," and "each hand will be responsible for the loss or careless damage of tools, stock, or any other property."

Mr. Blaine denounces these provisions as horrible, and as a "causeless and cruel oppression of a whole race." They are the product of a provisional government, which rested for its authority upon Mr. Lincoln's proclamation. And neither in their origin, their spirit, nor their purpose can they truthfully be laid to the charge of the Democrats. The fact that they may have passed into the subsequent legislation of the State can not change any responsibility that did attach to their origin or purpose. And if any one were to repeat that the enactment of such regulations of labor looks to its reënslavement, I would find the complete vindication from such a charge of the provisional government and its administration in the fact that the adoption of the State Constitution was concurrent, and that it provided for the immediate and unconditional emancipation of the slaves. In the year 1865 provisional governments were established over most of the other Southern States. The proclamations issued by Mr. Johnson rested upon and were very similar in their provisions to the proclamation issued by Mr. Lincoln. The latter proposed "to reinaugurate loyal State governments within and for their respective States," while the former proposed to restore the States to their "constitutional relations to the Federal Government." At that time Mr. Johnson was in harmony with the party that had elected him. It can not be truthfully said that for his conduct in 1865, or for the action of the governments which he established, the Democratic party is in any way responsible. In many respects the Democrats opposed the policy of 1865.

In 1867 the Republican party became so powerful in Congress as to be able to defy the Presidential veto. It overthrew the provisional State governments, and substituted its iron policy of reconstruction. That policy was embodied in the act of March, 1867, and the two acts supplementary thereto. The rebel States were declared to be without legal governments. They were divided into military districts, and placed under the absolute authority of military commanders. The commanders were authorized to take steps for the restoration of civil authority and the establishment of State governments. The work was supervised by the military. The negroes were admitted to a full participation, while many of the whites were excluded. The military and the negroes controlled the government. The effect was, to excite strife and create bad blood between the races. This was the beginning of the period of reconstruction. The evil influences already mentioned promoted and intensified the antagonism of the races. In such a strife the colored people became an easy prey to the unscrupulous adventurers who assumed to be their special friends. Bloodshed was frequent, and bad government was universal. Under such control the States continued for periods varying from six to nine years. I need not describe the condition of the people during that time. They endured all the evils and misfortunes that attend discordant society and bad government. It was the period of evil influences. Its legislation and its administrative service have left no record that can gratify the patriot. Neither race was as secure of any right of person or property as before it came, or after it passed away. It is barren of all fruits of good government. It is a plain over which the lava has flowed.

Then came this, the third period in the progress of restoration. It is yet short ; in some of the States but two years, and in others but three, four, and five years. But the work of restoration is complete. The right of local self-government is now enjoyed in all the States. The beneficent results of this period have been secured through the coöperation of the colored voters. What advantages have come to them, as a class, from the change from military rule to local self-government ! In the periods of provisional government and reconstruction Mr. Blaine has described the colored laborer as almost a slave. How is it now ? He is better protected in his wages by the laws of many Southern States than is the laborer in any Northern State. By the act of April 14, 1876, the laborer in Mississippi is given a lien for his wages upon the crop he helps to raise, and for his portion of the crop when it is upon shares. The

lien is prior to all others, and exists without record, and without any written contract. Upon judgments for wages no property is exempt from execution. These provisions were adopted at the first session after the Democrats obtained the control in Mississippi. By the act of February 24, 1873, the laborer in Georgia is given a lien for his wages upon the property of the employer, first above any other lien except for taxes, judgments, and decrees, and a special lien upon the products of his labor, above every other lien, except for taxes. In North Carolina the farm laborer is given a first lien upon the crop he helps to produce. In 1865, under the provisional government, South Carolina established and so regulated the domestic relations among the colored people as to promote their morality, virtue, and personal welfare. In the regulations of labor it was provided that "wages due to servants shall be preferred to all other debts or demands except funeral expenses, in case of the insufficiency of the master's property to pay all debts and demands against him."

I know of no Northern State that gives to the laborer such extraordinary protection and security for his wages. It has been sought, demanded, prayed for by the employees of great corporations, but it has been denied in many Northern States. The engineer, whose life is every hour at hazard, and the miner whose labor produces the wealth which others enjoy, have sought security for their wages, but have been denied. It was a free-will and cheerful offering by the people of the South, to place the wages of the negro next in payment to taxes and funeral expenses. Am I asked again why the colored man should vote with the Democrats? I answer, that it is a surer guarantee of his individual welfare, and that the political association is better than with the men who seek his confidence that they may use him for selfish ends.

Doubtless many acts of violence and wrong were done to colored people during the years immediately succeeding the close of the war. The contest had been long and bitter. The institution of slavery was associated in the minds of the people as one of the causes of the war. As a result of the war, the white man, impoverished in the struggle, was obliged to recognize the colored man, who had been his hereditary bondsman, as his political equal. Who could expect that tranquillity would at once settle down upon the scenes of such violent disturbance? The wildest optimist could not hope for that. All history teaches that the spirit of violence exists in more or less activity after the cessation of civil war. To look

for anything else would be as vain as to expect the ocean, vexed to its profoundest depths, to subside into instant tranquillity when the roar of the tempest is hushed. The difficulties necessarily incident to the condition of the country were aggravated by the unnatural policy which sought to place the emancipated race, in political rule, over the white race. Harmony could not at once follow. Indeed, it is hardly possible, so long as the colored men, in large masses, assume a position of distrust and hostility toward the white voters. The antagonism of race will disappear from our political contests when the colored people shall declare their freedom from the partisan ownership that is asserted over them, throw off the influence of the selfish adventurers who claim to control them, and assert their rights as free and independent voters.

Now, that thirteen years have passed since the close of the war, and the two races, during much of that period, have been living together as citizens equal before the law, while every year their political relations are becoming more harmonious, can the statesman find no better argument to show that the colored man holds his political rights by precarious tenure, than that founded upon social disturbances?

If I may accuse Mr. Blaine, in any instance, of employing an argument not quite up to the highest plane of statesmanship, and of leading this discussion into the arena of mere party politics, yet I must thank him for the closing paragraph of his last article. For patriotic sentiment, beauty of language, and grandeur of eloquence, it merits a high place among the noblest productions of the English language.

THOMAS A. HENDRICKS.